



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CURRENT OPINION

Science and an Organized Civilization

The task of science in the great undertaking of building a new world is treated by Professor W. E. Ritter in the *Scientific Monthly* for August. Taking the position that science is not merely an instrument of civilization, but an interpreter and participant in the deepest life of civilization, he maintains: (1) that no federation or compact of nations can possess the elements of permanency and usefulness, the main roots of which do not reach clear through the layers of social custom, formulated law, and ordinary political organization and convention, and penetrate deep into the nature of man himself; and (2) that such an understanding of man as this implies is primarily the province of science. "Biological anthropology, with special regard to its psychological aspect, is the only source of material for a proper foundation on which to build a truly useful and durable international structure."

Professor Ritter feels that the jurists, publicists, teachers, ministers of religion, and philosophers frequently take the attitude that they are the sole custodians of the higher welfare of man, but he is certain that humanistic learning cannot be maintained in detachment from scientific learning. "The statesman who would exclude the biologist and anthropologist from any voice in problems of government and social and industrial justice would be like an orange producer who would exclude the botanist and horticulturist from a voice in the problems of good and abundant oranges." An appeal to history shows that the men who have influenced the centuries and have been factors potent in the struggle for human welfare have also been men who took nature and the nature of man as their starting-point and constant base of reference. Aristotle and Cicero were nature-students.

So also Rousseau and Hugo Grotius sought to find the laws of nations in the laws of nature. God even cannot set aside the law of nature. On this basis, in the midst of the Thirty Years' War, Grotius sought to build the future law of nations. Today, with the world-cataclysm filling our eyes, our ears, our intellects, and our hearts, human nature stands before us in its nakedness. Such a time of shattered custom and law as this is exactly one which reveals the need of and gives the opportunity to science. But science must build on the actual and complete human nature. Linnaeus and Darwin placed man definitely and completely within nature. As an animal like all others, man may be described as the eating, propagating, mating, fearing, and fighting animal. But man, as man, is a "speaking, aesthetic, religious, thinking, political, economic, moral, and idealizing animal." Only by the consideration of all the attributes of man can we make a safe basis for scientific building of future civilization.

Taking up the single attribute which describes man as an economic animal, Professor Ritter shows that this is very important in the consideration of any future world-organization—that it is futile to hope to escape future military wars if commerce and industry are still considered as a sort of war, that economic needs are just as strong under democratic as under aristocratic rule, and men's fighting instincts do not depend alone or chiefly upon the form of government under which they live.

The world-war is a time of metamorphosis of world-civilization. If the titanic transformation taking place before our eyes shall be progressive rather than retrogressive, the economic system of civilization will emerge no less profoundly modified than the governmental systems. This commercial age of ours must be approaching its end if civilization is passing to a higher plane. Economism, as

several generations have understood the word, does insufferable violence to some of the profoundest instincts, the most precious interests of human life, and cannot survive in that higher civilization toward which the imagination and the ideals of all thoughtfully good men are turned.

Science will help in the transformation. Biology will show that the doctrine of the survival of the fittest, used to palliate and to justify unhuman methods in business and politics and war, rests upon a deep misunderstanding of the evolutionary process. Anthropology will convince those who take an extreme materialistic conception of human history and an extreme economic theory of human society that these doctrines imply a definition of the human species which is found to be very inadequate and fallacious in view of natural history. Chemists, physicists, geologists, agriculturists, and breeders of plants and animals will show the world that the latent resources of the lands and waters of the earth are sufficient to continue the progress of our species in civilization provided that civilization means a harmonious growth and interplay of the great groups of essentially human attributes named above, and also provided that the resources of the whole earth are utilized in accordance with the dictates of common wisdom and common justice.

The Vatican and the War

What is the diplomacy of the Vatican striving to accomplish? What will be the religious and political status of the Roman See after the war? These two questions are eagerly discussed in the current literature. Mr. George Herron in his book just published, *The Menace of Peace*, devoted a section to this theme in which he vehemently maintains that the silence of the Vatican in regard to the violation of Belgium, and the inhuman conduct of the war on the part of the Central Powers, was due to the tacit agreement that, if Italy were beaten in the

general success of the Hohenzollerns and Hapsburgs, the political aspirations never given up by the Roman pontiff would have a chance of realization. Now that there is no hope of the victory of the Germanic alliance, the Church of Rome is everywhere plotting for peace, which will mean now the saving of the last strongholds of Roman influence. Moreover, there is no doubt that the Vatican is able to see that the overthrow of autocracy in Germany and in the Dual Monarchy would make it difficult to maintain the autocratic and authoritative religious system of Rome in a democratic world. On this account he thinks Rome is striving frantically now to bring about a peace which will leave things *in statu quo*.

The remarkable attitude of the Roman church in taking an official stand in opposition to the selective draft in Canada is interpreted by some to mean that the main interest of the Vatican is to help in every possible way the Central Powers, always, of course, in the hope of benefit to the Holy See.

The *Review and Expositor* for July carries an article by an Italian, Romolo Nurr, on the topic, "Neutrality and the Vatican." He recalls the fact that at the outbreak of the war some people expected a vigorous protest from the pontiff against the provokers of the conflict, all the more so because the first of them was the sovereign of the most Catholic state, who had often ostentatiously shown his devout attachment to the Holy See. But Pope Pius X did not say a word publicly. When the new pope was chosen, Benedict received the vote because of his political rather than his religious abilities. The new pope condemned war in general terms, proclaimed the neutrality of Rome, but remained absolutely silent in regard to Germany's first acts against innocent, neutral nations and against the rights of nations. It was at once clear to the world that the neutrality of the Vatican was not an impartiality, considering

things from the standpoint of the eternal principles of God. "Does not this abstract invocation of ideal principles appear as a sign of impotence?" Mr. Nurr says in conclusion:

Never since the existence of the Papacy has it suffered so intimately from the mixture of religion and politics, the spiritual and the earthly, in which it has become constantly more involved. Its political interests attach it to the Central Powers; the religious interests, which it also desires to represent, would impel it to take a position for Belgium, for the cause of justice, for liberty of the nations, for international guarantees for peace—which is the cause of the Entente. It wished to avoid a choice. But is not silence a choice in itself? In the final analysis, if the Vatican *can* hold its peace, is it not because it holds, as Germany wishes, that it is confronted by a contest of forces for power and not by a struggle for and against the supreme moral rights of civilization?

The vigorous, political activity of the Vatican in Central Europe during the last few weeks gives rise to an editorial in the *New Republic* for July 21. The editor thinks the Vatican must find Cardinal Mercier an inconvenient figure, although it is plain that the moral implications of the war have not crowded in on the Holy Council any more than before. Rome is most of all and intensely interested in the political disposition of Europe. She must attempt to influence the march of events, and we ought to understand the exact purpose of her effort.

In the early days of the war the German Catholics were the most extreme supporters of advanced annexationism. There was no sign that Rome felt any difficulty in that stand. Today the tone has changed. The spokesman of the church at Berlin is praising the virtues of a peace which shall bring reconciliation and friendship to the whole of Europe. The Catholic Centre party has changed from being an efficient weapon in the hands of the Junker to becoming an integral part of the left wing of the Reichstag. Equally remarkable is the volteface

of Austria. The new emperor has been known for long to be an enthusiastic devotee of Rome. He shows unwillingness to bow to Hohenzollern control. He talks reform and amnesty. He speaks of his anxiety for a peace which will satisfy all the combatants.

What is the implication? Germany after the war is to be a Germany in which parliamentary control has at last become a reality. The Catholic party is, therefore, already making a striking bid for power in the new Germany. A powerful Centre party means a powerful Rome. Whatever German Catholics achieve is, in fact, a triumph for papal diplomacy, and the policy of the German Catholic leaders is in every step directed by the subtle strategists of the Vatican. So also in Austria. "In the Dual Monarchy there is the last modern state where the Roman alliance has at every historical stage been held to be of highest importance. Rome and Austria have the greatest bond of sympathy in their common hostility to the Italian advance. Austria is the last great stronghold of the counter-reformation of which modern Vaticanism is no more than the implicit development. On every phase of Austrian life, educational, political, economic, Roman clericalism has been able to set its mark." Hence, for her own sake Rome must keep Austria-Hungary intact. If the Hapsburgs go, the basis of Roman power is removed. The federalization of Austria would mean that Roman Catholicism would have to compete with other religions on equal terms. Rome is, therefore, advising the new emperor to seek peace, to preserve his possessions to as large a degree as is possible. Rome will thereby profit.

Is this interference of the papal power in politics dangerous at the present time? The *New Republic* thinks not: (1) because the general tenor of the advice given by Rome is in the line of the result for which the Allies have been working; (2) because fear

of Roman diplomacy is an anachronism. Roman influence, intellectually and politically, has been rapidly declining for thirty years. Pope Pius' repudiation of modernism did irreparable damage to Rome. "The factors which influence the balance of power in the modern world have been more and more concentrated toward a direction where Roman influence can be of less and less account. Her present effort is a swan-song, the more pathetic in that it is the dying expression of the last universal power."

War and Religion

A bewildering array of opinions as to the relation of religion to war in general and to the present war in particular is appearing in the current journalism. The October, special war number of the *International Journal of Ethics* carries an article by Dr. D. W. Fisher of Princeton. His subject is "War and the Christian Religion." He points out that the ideal meaning of the Christian religion, while it does not condemn war specifically, does condemn war in principle by its insistence upon love of God and of fellow-men. In its historical aspect, however, the Christian religion shows a different attitude to war. The church has never condemned war in its doctrine. For the first three centuries the Christian writers maintained a fairly consistent opposition to war, but opinion was divided. After the association of the church with the Roman state at the time of Constantine there was no thought of holding that war in general was inconsistent with the Christian religion. Ambrose and Augustine were followed by Thomas Aquinas and Grotius in holding that war might be just and lawful under certain circumstances. This has been the general Christian teaching. War and the Christian religion are fundamentally connected by virtue of the world-conditions in which the Christian ideal was under the necessity of being realized.

Both the Christian religion and war have been the enemies of materialism or sensualism. Sensualism means idleness and lack of striving for ideal motives. It emphasizes the satisfactions of the body rather than those of the spirit. To this the Christian religion has been resolutely opposed. So also has war. War has forced upon men the supersensible things called right, justice, duty, truth, and principle. It has filled men with a new conception of life and its purpose. In this task there is unity of action between war and Christianity.

It is a notable thing also that the pacifist has almost always been a rationalist and an enemy of the Christian religion, while the non-pacifist has been favorable to the Christian religion. Both war and religion are opposed to rationalism.

While there is evidently a connection between war and the Christian religion of history there is no connection between war and the ideal and absolute essence of the Christian religion. For historical Christianity it seems plain that other things may be more displeasing to God than war. Yet in a perfect world there will be no war. The Christian ideal portrays a world characterized by peace, not war. It would not be the peace of the pacifist-rationalist, however. A Christian kind of peace would be the peace of men who love God and their neighbors as themselves. It has never been realized, yet it is the only kind of peace enduring, spiritually vital, and lastingly possible.

In the *Unpopular Review* for October is a treatment of the general topic, "War and Religion," but the writer is quite evidently thinking of the Christian religion rather than religion in general. He takes a great deal of space to point out the endless opinions as to the cause of the war and the fact that each opinion reflects the well-defined interest of the man who expresses it. Ecclesiastics have traced it to the ebbing

of religious enthusiasm. But as a matter of fact the thing to be feared is the thing common to both ecclesiasticism and nationalism, namely, dogmatism. Faith in the creed, faith in the government, in both cases faith set over against reason—this is dogmatism. Dogmatism is a source of tremendous strength; it is also profoundly dangerous. "My country, right or wrong." "My doctrine, right or wrong: *credo quia absurdum*." That is dogmatism, and exactly the opposite of the open-mindedness of the scientific spirit.

Of course there is much religion that is not dogmatic; but when the religious spirit puts on the hard outer shell of orthodoxy it becomes a dogmatism akin to patriotism, which is only the arbitrary sacrament of the flag. Patriotism and orthodoxy are very much alike—the same outer trappings, in the one case the flag-draped rostrum, in the other the cross-emblazoned altar, the same pomp and ceremony, music, emblems, and group action. The church has caught the imperial spirit. Rationalism, seeking truth without partiality, is the enemy of authority. Authority binds us in advance to one point of view. That is dogmatism. It demands the destruction of the enemy. That is the spirit of war. Moreover, the church is essentially militant and war has been essentially religious. The whole European conflict as seen from the heart of any actual participant is a Holy War. It may be fairly doubted whether any great war could be carried on without that solemn religious conviction.

Not only are ecclesiasticism and militaristic nationalism alike in their respect for and dogmatic assertion of arbitrary authority, but they both find their logical opposite in the spirit of science. Science knows no authority whose utterances are immune from further testing and correction. It knows how to venerate the great man without canonizing his books. Science is non-dogmatic and, also, it has no national

boundaries. Thus it is not ecclesiasticism but its logical opposite that really stands for the elimination of prejudice and the harmony of spirit that make war on war. Dogmatic religion feeds the spirit of war. When religion, like science, becomes a sincere love for truth, a respect for duty, a full joy in all the beauty of the world and a profound desire to know God—then the more religion the less war.

There is a beautifully written article with a Nietzschean flavor from the pen of Horace Milborne in the October number of the *International Journal of Ethics*. The argument deals chiefly with the relation of the war to moral and political ideals; still the writer feels that under "The Hammer of Thor" not only moral and political convictions are going to pieces but that the hammer is falling also on current religion. The creeds and mythologies have been hammered sufficiently, long ago; now the ideals are being shaken. It is the fate of every religion to have its tomb built in a church. The church has forgotten its Bible and its intimation that power is the prius of good—Sinai before the Sermon on the Mount. There is no gospel of mere power, neither is there a gospel of mere peace and happiness: the true gospel is that of peace and happiness transmuted into something higher in the tragic calm of strife. Happiness is an illusion. The upward progress of man is achieved by the acceptance of tragedy—by clear-eyed facing of unequal conflict and predestined defeat, in the tragic peace of happiness overcome, and the tragic welcome of a fate he would challenge again and again. The meaning of tragedy is the meaning of life. It is the endless ache of the eternal will, the blind yearning of Nature's abortive travail. Tragedy was born of hero-worship, the oldest and still the living root of religion. Tragedy is the essence of religion. It is the purification of the soul from pity and fear, from sentiment and cowardice, from

happiness and peace, the Dionysiac draught of the cup of sorrow, the stern optimism of the conquest of happiness.

Another message born from the agony of the world-tragedy comes from Rev. Dr. Samuel McComb, who writes in the *Contemporary Review* for October under the title "The Great Companion." Today we are facing an immensely significant spiritual situation. Men realize that without a God of some kind life is intolerable. At the same time men realize that they are greater than their mere thinking, that the driving forces of life lie in the unconscious depths of the self—in needs, impulses, cravings, and instincts. We are no longer interested in the proofs of the existence of God. Our deep desire is for companionship, warmth, and blessedness, a sense of harmony with ourselves and the universe. Agnosticism has shown how great the word "God" is. Either he is the supreme basic reality into which all other realities run down or he is the empty figment of our imagination. We must treat tenderly those who have not the courage to say that they believe in God. All dogmatism, whether of science or religion, is henceforth impossible.

Man is essentially lonely, in sin, sorrow, suffering, temptation, and in spiritual growth. Others can never fully enter into the holy of holies. With the realization of

the failure of human association man turns instinctively to the great superhuman companionship. When we fail morally we can bear the vision of ourselves because of free and open speech with Him who is justice and sympathy and love; so we may escape both despair and self-complacency. So the Silent Presence lifts us victorious over our spiritual enemies. In grief, the prayer to the Father God eases our burden. In the realization that God is our ally, the support of our ideals, is no small guarantee of victory, for it strengthens us to meet the frowns of the world and the negative feeling of our own weakness. If the Great Companion should be proven to be dead, an intolerable loneliness and despair would settle upon the heart of mankind. But the companionship of God is real, experienced by myriads in all ages, and even though God has not broken silence for us we must believe on so great evidence. To feel that I am in God's world, bound up in a bundle of life with one infinitely greater and stronger than I and therefore master of every evil that can befall, robs pain of half its sting. But many cannot be conscious of this spiritual presence of God. To them Christ may be the mediator of the divine companionship. By brooding on his personality they may come to a realization of a living and dynamic Love at the center of the universe.